




CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JULY 19, 2023

FROM: DIRECTOR GINO BETTS 
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2023OPA-0040

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional.	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections are written in the first person.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

It is alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1) harassed and demoralized the Complainant by repeatedly calling him to serve a protection order.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

This case was approved for Expedited Investigation. That means OPA, with the Office of Inspector General's agreement, believed it could reach and issue recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation without interviewing the involved employee. As such, OPA did not interview the involved employee in this case.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

A. OPA Complaint & Interview of Complainant

On January 20, 2023, the Complainant alleged that NE#1 harassed him by calling him several times. OPA interviewed the Complainant twice. First, the Complainant told OPA that NE#1 called and texted him several times, indicating he had paperwork for the Complainant.

In a second lengthy interview, the Complainant stated that NE#1 "demoralized" him by attempting to serve him with a court order. The Complainant did not elaborate on how NE#1 harassed or demoralized him other than expressing his displeasure with being served an order.

B. Court Records

Court records showed that the King County District Court granted a petition for an Anti-Harassment Order against the Complainant. The Court forwarded the order to the Seattle Police Department for service.



C. Police Employee Data System Information

NE#1 – a detective – was assigned to the Coordinated Criminal Investigations Section, Special Victim’s Unit in the Order Service Squad at the time of the complaint.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1

5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional.

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 harassed and demoralized him by calling and texting him to serve a court order. SPD employees must “strive to be professional.” SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10. Further, “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers,” whether on or off duty. *Id.* “Any time employees represent the Department or identify themselves as police officers or Department employees, they will not use profanity directed as an insult or any language derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful toward any person.” *Id.*

Here, NE#1’s unit served court orders. NE#1 contacted the Complainant to serve an Anti-Harassment Order. While the Complainant disagreed with the order and considered NE#1’s attempts to serve the order harassment, NE#1 was performing his assigned duties.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)**